IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN

THURSDAY, THE 1ST MARCH 2007 / 10TH PHALGUNA 1928

RP.No. 236 of 2007(H)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.5954/2007 Dated 23/02/2007
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN WP(C):

GOVINDAN NAMBOOTHIRI T.N.,
S/O. T.G.NARAYANAN NAMBOOTHIRI, AGED 23 YEARS,
THOTTAM ILLAM, P.O. KOTTAPPADY, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT
PIN-686 695.

BY ADV. SRI.MILLU DANDAPANI

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS IN WP(C):
----

1. **MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,**
   PRIYADARSHINI HILLS, KOTTAYM-686560,
   REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.

2. **THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS,**
   MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, KOTTAYAM-686560.

3. **JAI BHARAT ARTS & SCIENCE COLLEGE,**
   PERUMBAVOOR, REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL.

BY ADV. SRI.V.A.MUHAMMED, SC, M.G.UNIVERSITY

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 01/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

THOTTATHIL.B.RADHAKRISHNAN.J

R.P. No. 236 of 2007

Dated this the 1st day of March 2007

ORDER

In view of the judgment in W.P.(C) No. 4075 of 2006, in the judgment sought to be reviewed, I came to the conclusion that it is inappropriate to permit the petitioner to go for the examination since this court had found that he was not entitled to continue in the course. Since he was unqualified, which is the effect of the judgment in W.P. (C) No.4075 of 2006, I dismissed W.P.(C) No 5954 of 2007. The ground urged for review is that certain representations to the University authorities to complete the course and write the examination were not placed while the judgment sought to be reviewed was filed. I am clear in my mind that even if such representations were brought to the notice of this Court, I would not have taken a different view. Under the circumstances I find no ground to review the judgment dated 23-2-2007 in W.P.(C) No. 5954/2007. Accordingly this Review Petition is dismissed .

THOTTATHIL.B.RADHAKRISHNAN.JUDGE

es